



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXXXI.

JUNE, 1908.

THE CLAIMS OF THE CANDIDATES.

BY AUGUSTUS THOMAS, GEORGE F. MILTON, TOM FINTY, JR.,
WALTER EDWARD HARRIS, THOMAS SPEED MOSBY, THOMAS F.
BAYARD, EDWARD B. WHITNEY, THOMAS D. O'BRIEN,
O. O. STEALEY, AND MAYO W. HAZELTINE.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

THE reasons for the nomination of a candidate of either party may be divided broadly into those of expediency and those of sentiment.

In the first division, while there may be such remote considerations as the upbuilding of a party for future contests, the obliteration of undesirable control and the like, the chief question is the chance of success in the immediately ensuing elections. Under this head—the chance of success—must be considered, first, the strength of the man himself measured by the popularity of his position upon questions which divide public opinion; and, secondly, his strength of that kind compared with that of his probable or possible antagonist, the leader of the opposing party.

The question uppermost in the mind of the American electorate to-day is the undue influence of wealth upon the Government as that influence is expressed, not only legally and overtly, but also illegally and covertly. In one or the other of these fields

of its expression and activity are to be found all of the evils of which the great body of the people make complaint.

The open influence of wealth used oppressively has an example in the establishment of the protective tariff and in the successful resistance of any attempt within the ranks of the dominant party to revise that tariff. It has another example in the use of the courts in the so-called government by injunction. Still another in the paralysis of executives when the laws against the big criminals are permitted to slumber while those against the small offenders are drastically enforced.

The covert use of wealth has many examples brought to light through judicial and legislative investigation showing the corrupting of executive and legislative officers, the corrupt arrangement with party managers to nullify ante-election promises, and the suppression of the people's voice in the elections themselves.

Outside of the machinery of government the iniquitous effect of the influence of wealth is felt in the discrimination of the railroads in favor of the large shipper and the exploitation of the public through the dishonest manipulation of corporate stocks.

No man in the United States in either party stands so indelibly associated with the protest against all of these evils as Mr. Bryan stands. A majority of his party knows, and all the members of both parties may be brought to know, that the last three Democratic National platforms have contained planks demanding the enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission with a view to correct the evils of railroad discrimination, also planks demanding the vigorous prosecution of trusts, the revision of the tariff, and the forbidding of judicial writs in industrial disputes except after notice to defendants and full hearing, and that these planks, while absent from the Republican platform, were in the Democratic documents chiefly through the advocacy and influence of Mr. Bryan.

It is also a fact that the principal reforms which have come to be associated with President Roosevelt in the public mind and in the demand for which his party is by no means unanimous, were first indicated by Mr. Bryan as the needed remedies possible by National legislation. In his Madison Square Garden speech in August, 1906, Mr. Bryan advocated specifically the enforcement of the criminal clause in the cases against the trusts—a correction of the evil known as government by injunction—the

enactment of an eight-hour law—arbitration in labor disputes—a graduated income tax—the prohibition of campaign contributions from corporations, and a Federal license for corporations. President Roosevelt, in his message six months later, recommended to Congress the enactment of legislation to each and all of these ends.

The recommendations of President Roosevelt are popular with the people, however unwelcome and tiresome they may be to Congressmen and Senators. Because of these recommendations the President himself is popular. His popularity, judging from present indications, is such that nothing but his repeated refusal to be again a candidate can prevent his renomination in the approaching National convention of his party.

Of all the men thus far named in connection with the Democratic nomination only Mr. Bryan is at all associated in the public mind with these enumerated policies. He is not only associated with the policies, but he very properly is recognized as their strongest and first and most consistent advocate.

If it shall be possible next November to elect a Democratic President that possibility will exist chiefly because accessions may be gained from Republican ranks. Those accessions may come either from the progressionists, who form the Roosevelt wing of the party, or from the reactionists, who form the Cannon wing. The members of the Cannon wing, however, are the stand-patters, the hard-shell protectionists. The Roosevelt Republicans are the men who are conscious of existing evils, who confess the need of tariff revision, and who form the progressive and mobile element of their party. If a successful bid for assistance and support can be made to either wing it is to this latter. The popularity of Roosevelt's measures with these men is not because of Roosevelt, but Roosevelt himself is popular with them because of his measures. It is the fact of a man personally expressing policies.

As far as any man can be himself the expression of a policy Mr. Bryan expresses, and in pre-eminent degree, the vital policies of the Democracy.

There are those within the party who believe that the sole issue is the tariff, that all of the evils are traceable to this iniquity. The difference between those members and Mr. Bryan is merely one of terms. Mr. Bryan believes that the tariff itself in its present form is not the product of the wisdom of the country

nor yet of the wisdom of the party that is responsible for it, but that it exists through the demand of interests now predatory in their activity.

Coming to the consideration of the candidate's strength as practically recorded, we must recall that when in 1904, under the leadership of the New York "World" and other so-called Democratic organs suffering, as Mr. Watterson described them, from both provincialism and landlordism—some of them from absentee landlordism—the party abandoned the forward movement inaugurated by Mr. Bryan and retreated to the parade-ground dominated by Mr. Parker, the total vote of Democracy in the United States fell 1,280,000 behind its total vote of four years before. An attempt to account for and to locate this loss results, first, in the discovery that Mr. Roosevelt, with all his San Juan popularity, increased the national vote for McKinley only 414,000. Nearly one million Democratic votes reported among the missing, therefore, must be assumed to have been left in the trenches of the enemy and beside the abandoned standards of the Bryan Democracy.

When we consider his strength in comparison with the strength of the Republican candidate—probably Taft, possibly Roosevelt—we have only to decide whether the public faith and allegiance will flock to those standards borrowed from Democracy and raised by Mr. Roosevelt above a mutinous Congress, as notably in the recent refusal to repeal the duty on wood pulp, or whether the public faith and allegiance would follow the same standards in the hands of Mr. Bryan, who first raised them and who has unceasingly supported them and behind whom there would be a united Democracy.

Mr. Bryan's ability to stand inflexibly for a principle, his superiority to clamor, has been shown on many occasions and in many trying situations. There is a well-founded belief in the public mind that as an executive he would abide by the provisions of the Constitution, feel himself bound by their restriction and insist upon their enforcement, and that neither the legislative nor the judicial department of our Government would feel the encroachment of the executive.

Mr. Bryan is informed upon Old World affairs and conditions. His information has been gained by personal visits, examinations and study, and is of a practical quality and modern equipment—

perhaps more valuable to a Chief Executive than a literary willingness to write critically of English history. Of the United States his knowledge, both intimate and comprehensive, is exceeded by that of no other man. He knows the country, its cross-roads, its hamlets, its towns, its cities; he knows its resources, its people, their needs. His almost continuous journeyings through the States have been for purposes of intercourse with their citizens and not to acquire camp-fire tales or nature stories.

If we turn from Bryan to the selection of some other candidate from the ranks of Democracy, we look in vain for one with a sufficiently assuring record, for one well enough known to the rank and file of the party, or for one who could be sufficiently introduced between now and election by any possible campaign of education to unite the party and invoke the enthusiasm necessary to victory.

It cannot be successfully disputed that Mr. Bryan has the personal affection of a greater number of Democratic voters than any three candidates combined. In the last twelve years, with the exception of two trips abroad, the majority of his Sundays have been occupied by the delivery of addresses and sermons to religious congregations of mixed political beliefs. The voters of his own political opinions in these audiences have been strengthened in their devotion to him. Those of opposing parties have acquired a personal appreciation and respect for him which have taken the place of former misapprehension and distrust. On many Sundays two of these addresses, sometimes three, have been delivered in a day and evening. A conservative estimate may place the number of voters, members of religious organizations, who have listened to Mr. Bryan in that time at 250,000. In addition to this number probably 1,000,000 citizens have attended the lectures which Mr. Bryan has given in his regular tours, exclusive of the free political gatherings that he has addressed. These auditors have invariably gained a high opinion of the sincerity, the profundity, the stability of the lecturer. It is impossible to listen to Mr. Bryan through an extended discourse and not gain an added appreciation of the character of the man. The impression that he makes at these times is abiding, and no estimate of his strength with the people is reliable that omits from its calculation the friends he has gained in these talks of a non-political kind.

A great writer has said that "Napoleon, discarding the established rules of war, conquered Europe with the bivouac." Mr. Bryan, temporarily deserted by the managers of the so-called conservative wing of his organization, regained and held the hearts of its rank and file by personal and fraternal contact. He has made converts and recruits. Other candidates in the party may command equal respect, but no other can so thoroughly evoke, sustain and augment the enthusiasm necessary to a militant and progressive and successful campaign.

AUGUSTUS THOMAS.

EDWARD WARD CARMACK.

THE measure of character of the subject of this sketch was taken in Tennessee in the year 1896.

For nine years he had been engaged in newspaper work. First elected to the office of justice of the peace of Maury County, Tennessee, and then, when only twenty-seven, sent to the Legislature, he had not given himself up wholly to politics. An opportunity offering in 1887, he took up editorial work on the Nashville "American." In 1892, he left that paper to establish the Memphis "Commercial." For three years the contest between the new aspirant and its competitor, the "Appeal Avalanche," with long and honorable history, was bitter. It was largely due to Carmack's able pen that the supremacy of the new paper was finally established. The brilliant editor was now at the head of his profession in the State. He received a salary which was at that time the highest paid to any editor in the South. He had every reason to be proud of the position which, unaided, he had created for himself. His name was linked with that of the "Commercial-Appeal." His newspaper was widely circulated over three States. He could reasonably look forward to a career of emolument and honor. It was at this time, however, that the country became absorbed in the discussion of the currency question. Josiah Patterson represented the Tenth district of Tennessee in the House of Representatives. He had been in favor of free silver, but through the influence of Grover Cleveland now espoused the views of his chief and became a candidate for reelection to Congress. The principal owners of the "Commercial-Appeal" were friends of Patterson. They were conservative

business men. They insisted that Mr. Carmack support Patterson in the columns of the "Commercial-Appeal," whatever might be his individual views. The brilliant young editor did not hesitate. Wealth and ease were on one side, and uncertainty as to his future on the other. But he never wavered. His resignation was sent in and he left the paper which he had created and on which he had stamped his individuality.

Thus Tennessee came to know Edward Ward Carmack.

Since that time none has doubted his honor, his courage or his sincerity.

The young journalist, thrown adrift by reason of his conscience, found himself the logical candidate of those of his view against Josiah Patterson, and from that resignation out of journalism—giving up all the fruits, apparently, of the work of years—has come a public life which has extended over the ensuing twelve years, and is not likely soon to be ended.

In the memorable race for Congress, which followed, Carmack secured a majority over Patterson. The latter contested his seat, however, and the final scene in the contest between these two big men was on the floor of the House at the Capitol, where each argued his own case. Patterson thought he would receive the support of the Republicans, because of the fact that he was a gold Democrat, many of whom had cast their votes for Mr. McKinley. Mr. Carmack's speech in his own behalf marked his entrance on the national arena. It was considered one of the great speeches of the session. Rarely in the history of a Congress has a member of the minority whose seat has been contested been able to secure votes of the majority, or to induce them to refrain from voting. Despite the appeals which Mr. Patterson made, however, the Republicans were carried away by Carmack's great address, so full of wit, sarcasm, logic and invective, for which all his speeches have been notable, and he was sustained in his seat. It was in this speech that he termed the mugwump "a political mule having neither the pride of ancestry nor hope of posterity," a phrase which has stuck.

Mr. Carmack served two terms in the House. On the death of Isham G. Harris, in 1897, Governor Robert L. Taylor appointed Thomas B. Turley to succeed him. When the Legislature convened Turley was a candidate for the remaining unexpired term of Harris and had as his opponent Benton McMillin, for a long

time Democratic leader in Congress. Mr. Carmack managed Mr. Turley's campaign and Turley was re-elected. This contest, however, was provocative of political animosities which have since followed him and were prominent in his own campaign for re-election to the Senate last year.

In the United States Senate, to which he was elected in 1900, Mr. Carmack made more reputation in a single term of service than any other Southern Senator, except, probably, Ben Hill, of Georgia. He came to the front almost immediately. The Philippines was the uppermost topic, and he bitterly opposed imperialism. In the Tennessee State Convention of 1900 a large number of delegates favored a platform which did not commit the Democratic party to opposition to the policy of expansion. At a critical time in the discussion Mr. Carmack was called for and in ringing terms he denounced the imperialistic programme. He secured the adoption of a substitute for the resolutions reported, the substitute declaring unmistakably against the policy of the administration. Mr. Carmack was a member of the Philippines Committee of the Senate. He denounced "benevolent assimilation," terming it "malevolent dissimulation." He put life into the Democratic opposition to the party in power. The nominal leader of the Senate was Senator James K. Jones. Younger men, like Carmack, Bailey and Culbertson, were the active floor leaders. It was largely at his instance that some of the cruelties practised in the Philippines were shown up. Some of his conservative friends thought he went too far in his denunciation of the policy of imperialism, but events finally brought the thinking people of the country very much to his point of view.

Personally, Mr. Carmack was popular with members of both parties in Washington. In impromptu debate he was at his best. Senator Spooner, skilled parliamentarian, learned lawyer and shrewd beyond most of his party fellows, said that Carmack was the only man he really feared in debate. It was not to be expected that this bold spirit could accord with that of Mr. Roosevelt. After the President had found himself mercilessly roasted on the Carmack gridiron a few times he lost his temper. Carmack said of the President: "He resembles in his habits of speech my friend Joe Ballanfant's horse, of which remarkable animal it was said that running away was his natural gait." This comparison probably broke the camel's back. Invitations to

the White House came no more to the Tennessee Senator. He did not care, however. No man was more utterly indifferent to patronage or Executive favors.

On January 16th, 1907, he defended the action of the Executive in the Brownsville matter. He opened his speech by saying:

"The President once said that he would see a certain member of the Tennessee delegation in Hades before he would do anything for him, a remark that was entirely gratuitous, in view of the fact that the person referred to had never stooped to ask a favor at his hand, but with supreme indifference to his opinion had censured him when he was wrong, and with a like indifference to his opinion can support him when he is right."

Mr. Carmack's ridicule of the President was in its richest form in his speech on the Indianola post-office case, February 24th, 1903. Mr. Roosevelt had persisted in the appointment of a negro postmistress in defiance of the sentiment of the people of that Mississippi town, and, when the people had refused to get their mail at the post-office, had closed it. This speech was one of the best expressions of the position of the white men of the South on the race question. Replying to Senator Spooner, of Wisconsin, he said:

"The Senator from Wisconsin, seizes upon certain inconsequential expressions like 'unpleasantness' and 'strained relations,' and he finds them a threat of violence as easily as Sergeant Buzfuz found a proposal of marriage in the words 'chops and tomato sauce.' I ask, Mr. President, if this is worthy the man of the 'strenuous life'; he who rode into the jaws of death and the mouth of hell, who showed like Bellona's bridegroom on the red edge of battle, who the 'multitudinous seas incarnadined' with the crimson torrent which from the top of San Juan hill ran bubbling to the main—he abandons his post of duty and flies beaten and discomfited by a little band of ruffians [laughter]. What a lame and impotent conclusion for this strenuous administration! . . .

"Mr. President, we are the same kind of people you are, or would be under the same circumstances. The Southern people are the purest blooded Americans in this country. They are not cruel; they are not bigoted; they do not hate the negro; they sincerely wish him well. But they have this characteristic which is in the blood of their race, they will not divide sovereignty and dominion of their own country with a lower or inferior race."

Referring to a division of the white vote he said it would lead to a riot of corruption at elections.

"We know, Mr. President, how far men will go in the stress of politics. We know the progressive power of debauchery. We know how the public

conscience is calloused by long contact with corruption. What may not be done in States where there are thousands of voters eager to be bribed and without any sense of shame or consciousness of moral delinquency in the transaction? So, Mr. President, I say that while present conditions are unfortunate, it would be tenfold worse; it would be ruinous and destructive to all the Southern States if the white people should ever divide and the colored vote should wield the balance of power."

One of the great speeches made by Mr. Carmack was on the Brownsville affair, in the course of which he said:

"President Roosevelt must fight the course, and I say to the Senators upon the other side of the chamber, you must take your alternative, you must either renominate Theodore Roosevelt, or you must give us back our platform. You have got to do it. It was never yours. In your hearts you are longing for the time to come when you can cast off this Rooseveltian incubus. The Republican party, for the first time in years, will look natural when it sits for its photograph in the next campaign. But, Mr. President, in the mean while the sentiment which President Roosevelt has created, which he has helped to arouse against plutocracy, will turn millions of voters to the ranks of the Democratic party, and if President Roosevelt himself chooses to come, he will find there ample opportunity to render great service to the American people and to learn some respect for the Constitution and the law."

The last speech of Senator Carmack in the Senate was on March 3rd, 1907, when he talked the Ship Subsidy bill to sleep, much to the amusement of the Senate and apparently to the satisfaction of the country. Usually filibusters arouse angry feeling. That of Mr. Carmack, put up by the Democrats for this unpleasant duty, had none of the usual features. Although he held the floor for many hours his remarks were so interlarded with wit that they kept the Senate in good humor.

Mr. Carmack was succeeded in the Senate by ex-Governor Robert L. Taylor. This is no reflection on Mr. Carmack, but merely proves that "Bob" Taylor is the most popular man in the State since "Lean Jimmy" Jones rubbed the coon-skin in the campaign of 1840 and defeated James K. Polk, afterward President. The campaign, while hotly contested, left no ill feeling and Taylor and Carmack are now good friends. He was not allowed to remain long in private life. Although he was offered lecture engagements worth \$7,500 the first year, he yielded to the insistent demand that he become a candidate for Governor. The county primaries which will decide the issue occur June 27th. Mr. Carmack has been the leader in Tennessee in the fight against

the open saloon, and this will, no doubt, be one of the issues. He is an advocate of the direct primary in the nomination of candidates by political parties, and, as the State Executive Committee denied such a primary, this question will be discussed. Mr. Carmack was recently suggested by "Harper's Weekly" for the Presidency, and there has also been talk of nominating him for the Vice-Presidency.

Mr. Carmack's mind is saturated with the fundamental principles of Democratic faith. He thinks that every unconstitutional extension of Federal power as against the States, or of the Executive power as against other departments of the Government, should be resisted. He favors keeping well within the "shadow of our rock of safety, the counsel of Washington and the maxims of Jefferson in our foreign policy." He advocates the "putting aside of all dreams of conquest and colonial empire, and the casting out of the devil of militarism from the hearts of the people." He thinks one of the deadliest of monopolies is "the monopoly of power in the government at Washington." On the tariff question he is conservative. "I realize," he says, "that even a vicious policy that has rooted in the industrial system of the country cannot be destroyed at a blow without danger of catastrophe. Free trade in England was not attained by sudden flight, but by the gradual elimination of protective duties, each step justifying itself and gaining confidence for the next. The Democratic party should move gradually, but steadily, toward the goal of a tariff for revenue alone—tariff that will yield the largest possible proportion of revenue with the least possible protection."

"Ned" Carmack, as he is familiarly known in Tennessee, is a man without any political machine, except such as he has established in the hearts of the people by his great qualities. He is not a hand-shaker or letter-writer. He knows nothing about intrigue. He is open and aboveboard. He does not trim or truckle. Without any apparent effort on his part and without what ordinarily is called personal magnetism, he draws men to him by his courage, his manliness and his matchless ability. When he was defeated for the United States Senate strong men wept. On his retirement his friends gave him a loving-cup on which were engraved the words in an editorial in the Washington "Post" of February 2nd, 1907:

"He would have been an ornament to British Parliaments that knew Burke and Fox and Pitt. He would have been distinguished in American Senates that contained Clay and Calhoun and Webster. He might have been rich. He had but to stoop. . . . But in the true sense who dares say this American Senator is poor? Where is the man who does not respect him? All the wealth of either Ind would not buy for the base his lofty character, his unblemished honor."

Those who have followed his career do not think these words extravagant. That at some future day the nation will again claim his services, the Tennessee people do not doubt. He is only fifty years old, his faculties are at their very best. Few men have had such a career, so rich with experience, so triumphant in victories and so marked in growth. He has those endowments which the Latin philosophers believed necessary for the best earthly success, "a sound mind in a sound body." It is not beyond the range of probability that some day, with a truly reunited country, the South, the palladium of Anglo-Saxon institutions, will furnish to the nation a defender of constitutional liberty in the person of this brilliant Tennessean.

GEORGE F. MILTON.

CHARLES ANDERSON CULBERSON.

FOR forty-three years the South and its favorite sons have held aloof from contests for the nation's honors through a sense of duty and loyalty to the dominant party of the South. Within very recent years, however, the idea has grown that the time is near at hand when the Democratic party would choose its standard-bearer from a Southern State; and during the past three years that feeling has found voice in the definite expression of a hope, both North and South, that Charles Anderson Culberston, senior United States Senator from Texas, should head the national ticket of the Democratic party.

Pronounced in his friendship for and advocacy of Mr. Bryan, Senator Culberston has discouraged the mention of his own name in this connection with such earnestness as to leave no doubt of his sincerity. Nevertheless, his friends take comfort in the thought that should his own choice fail to receive the nomination, the Democracy will logically turn to him for leadership.

His long public career, marked by high achievement; a record without blemish; demonstrated great ability as lawyer and as executive officer; conservatism, caution, courage and discretion

are urged as entitling Senator Culberson to consideration as a Presidential possibility.

By inheritance, breeding and education he is a type of the very highest American citizenship. Of Scotch-Irish ancestry, his mother was of the famous Crawford family of Georgia, a member of which, William Harris Crawford, was a United States Senator, minister to France, Secretary of War and Secretary of the Treasury, in the early part of the last century, and in 1824 was a candidate for President as an exponent of the views of Jefferson. No man ever enjoyed greater or fairer fame as lawyer, jurist, statesman and patriot than did Senator Culberson's father, the late David B. Culberson, who, until but a decade ago, was a colossal figure in the American Congress. Before the Civil War Judge Culberson was a Whig and Unionist. When the war came he followed the fortunes of his State, as did Lee, and became a soldier of the Confederacy.

Counselled by a most conservative father, and being witness in his boyhood, in the years immediately following the war, to the most terrible political strife that has ever cursed this country, it is but natural that conservatism should be a leading trait in the character of Charles A. Culberson.

Senator Culberson is absolutely devoid of superlatives and floridity of expression. He is precise, accurate, methodical and punctual, his conduct conforming in the fullest degree to the famous precept of Davy Crockett, "Be sure you are right: then go ahead." And he is quite as sure to go when he knows he is right, as he is to be sure he is right before he starts. He leaves nothing to chance, but is a close observer, an untiring student, an adept investigator, possessing marvellous skill as a developer of facts. Although social and companionable, he is nevertheless markedly non-communicative. The average man tells Culberson all he knows; Culberson has never had to reproach himself for misplaced confidence or for talking too much.

His ability as an investigator and his penchant for absolute accuracy and precision in statement have made him invincible and invulnerable in his declarations. Long ago friends and adversaries came to know that when Culberson said anything, it could be taken for granted he was prepared to verify every detail in many ways. Devotion to accurate truth carried him successfully through his brilliant but turbulent terms as Attorney-

General and Governor of Texas, and his attention to details enabled him to master every question which arose touching any branch of government. His strength in this regard is well illustrated by his literary taste, which is largely turned in the direction of history. Perhaps no other man in the public life of this country knows as much of the minute history, the details, of the battles of the Civil War, and of other great battles of the world, and of the giant figures of history.

An orator of great ability, brilliance and power, Senator Culberson rarely makes public speeches, never when he can avoid doing so; but when he does speak, his utterances are thought out and delivered with that degree of care which characterizes the opinions of our higher courts. A master of the English language, his speeches are pure in diction, flawless in rhetoric and simplified to the last degree. He has never been called upon to explain or correct a public utterance, and, when he has spoken upon a subject, little, if anything, remains to be said.

Aggressive, without being impetuous, Senator Culberson is remarkably prescient and investigates in advance of possible contingencies, and is therefore prepared to act when action is necessary or desirable. For instance, while Governor of Texas, he seemingly had a man picked to fill every possible vacancy. Committees journeying to the capital to advance the claims of favorite sons would find that the vacancies had "just been filled." When he has reached a conclusion, he is prompt to act, and presses the object with a determination which will brook no interference. In fact, he is rather disposed to obstinacy, and upon the defensive is a resourceful and insatiable antagonist.

Senator Culberson had the very best of educational advantages, his alma mater being the University of Virginia. Upon leaving it he immediately won recognition as an able lawyer and magnificent advocate, and, entering politics, he was elected to every office to which he aspired, making an enviable record in each. To his preparatory school—the Virginia Military Institute—Senator Culberson largely owes his sense of order and his extraordinary capacity for organization. The elder Culberson, being a product of "the old school," used to say that the bane of his life was that he never could find his hat. He determined that his son should be trained in method. Therefore, he sent him to the military school.

In his earlier campaigns, Senator Culberson was several times hard pressed, but when the returns came in his State was astonished at the amount of political work done and the magnificence of the army which had been called into action. In the South he has no superior as an organizer, and never had one. His work is done with precision, but quietly, without disturbing the surface, yet it is always clean, subject to inspection.

While still serving as Governor, he won the nomination of his party for his first term as Senator before the campaign had fairly started, defeating Hon. Roger Q. Mills. And this notwithstanding Culberson had spent eight tempestuous and busy years as Attorney-General and Governor, antagonizing many influential persons and interests by succeeding in his undertakings.

He made a brilliant record as Attorney-General, defending the reforms instituted by the administration of Governor Hogg, who had been his predecessor in the legal department, as well as in important litigation instituted upon his own initiative. His most notable achievement in this office was his successful defence of the Railroad Commission Law, at that time (1891) the most far-reaching measure designed for government regulation of carriers. Its validity being upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States, the law has been copied to some extent by many other States; some of its provisions are embodied in the Federal rate law of 1906, and some of the reforms now advocated by President Roosevelt are its salient features.

The administration of Governor Hogg was characterized by the enactment of laws to regulate corporations. Its fiscal policy was weak. Culberson's administration was notable chiefly for activity and vigor in the enforcement of the laws, the reformation of the State and county governments and a strong fiscal policy. He put the State upon a cash basis by raising revenue, reducing expenses and cutting off excrescences. He secured the passage of a law which deprived thousands of officers throughout the State of the swollen fortunes which they had been receiving through fees of office, requiring them to turn the surplus over to the public treasury. When the Legislature failed to heed his recommendations, he made demands. A general appropriation bill was passed carrying a total largely in excess of the limit he had suggested as safe. Reconvening the Legislature in extraordinary session, he vetoed the bill, and announced that the

legislative branch of the Government would be held at work until it passed a bill within the limits named by the executive. The result can be imagined.

The Legislature passed a bill granting the Southern Pacific Company authority to consolidate its Texas railways. Governor Culberson vetoed it, and wrote a message which made the State gasp. He declared that the members of the Legislature had been "blandished" with free passes. An effort to pass the measure notwithstanding the veto failed.

Two other instances well illustrate his determination and imperturbability. In the spring of 1895 he gave public warning that the proposed Corbett-Fitzsimmons fight would not be permitted to take place. Nevertheless, preparations for the fight went forward, and feeling ran high. Governor Culberson went to the storm centre—the city of Dallas, which was the situs of the projected fistic carnival, and the Governor's home city as well—and in the streets he made speeches of the riot-act order, reiterating his purpose. Then a judge of the court of last resort declared the anti-prize-fight law invalid. Governor Culberson, to the astonishment of practically everybody, convened the Legislature, and had an anti-prize-fight law "with teeth in it" passed. The old law carried a fine penalty. The new one made the offence penal. In consequence, Carson City got the fight.

When Mr. Bryan's eloquence swept the Chicago convention off its feet, the venerable John H. Reagan and former Governor Hogg, both of whom Culberson loved, joined other members of the Texas delegation in begging Culberson, the chairman, to permit the Texas guidon to join in the frenzied march around the Coliseum. Calm and unmoved by the excitement, he answered that the guidon would not march, and march it did not. "We are instructed for Bland," said he, "and, so far as I am concerned, we stay for Bland." When the ballot was completed, the Texas guidon, like the flag, "was still there." Only when Bryan had been nominated did it move.

Senator Culberson is democratic in thought and conduct without being demagogic; cordial without being voluble, and companionable without being hail-fellow. He is a fine-looking man, dignified, erect as an Indian, of military bearing, patrician features, and immaculate in dress. A generous man, he is nevertheless economical and guilty of no extravagant habits. Greed,

the desire to make money, has never seized upon him, his total accumulations, both from earnings and inheritance, probably not exceeding \$50,000.

The talents which made Senator Culberson so successful in his public career in Texas have gained him recognition in the Senate of the United States as one of the ablest debaters, learned lawyers and soundest statesmen of that body, and he has been called to the highest place within the gift of his party in the Senate, the leadership of the minority.

A type of the highest American citizenship; by birth, breeding, education and experience superbly fitted to command and direct; clean in his personal life; impeccable in his official career, Charles A. Culberson, those who know him best believe, is logically the man to lead his party to victory, and admirably qualified to serve the nation in its highest office.

TOM FINTY, JR.

JOHN WARWICK DANIEL.

WHEN William Jennings Bryan delivered his Madison Square Garden speech in 1906, in which he declared that in his opinion the general Government would have to assume the ownership of the railway lines, he made the country gasp. Lack of breath may have been responsible for the delay of many of the leading men of his party in expressing their views regarding Mr. Bryan's attitude. It is equally possible that some doubt as to how the views of Mr. Bryan on this subject were regarded by the majority of Democrats was responsible for the silence of the party's leaders.

The first man of national prominence in the Democratic party to express vigorous dissent from Mr. Bryan's views was John W. Daniel, of Virginia. As soon as Senator Daniel returned to Washington from New York, whither he had gone to join in welcoming Mr. Bryan on his return from his trip around the world, he gave out an interview in which he exercised his wonderful command of English to make it plain that no doctrine could have been enunciated which was more abhorrent to the traditional tenets of the Democratic party than that of Federal ownership of railways. Since Senator Daniel's utterance on the subject scores of men high in the councils of his party have

followed the Virginia Democrat in declaring against this radical departure from traditional Democracy.

In the early nineties Senator Daniel declared for the free and unlimited coinage of silver. It was no new doctrine to him, although it was one the urgent necessity of applying which had not, in his judgment, arisen during his term of public service. Senator Daniel was among the first of Eastern Democrats to declare for free coinage. It caused him to break with many party friends of long standing, and in some instances it cost him personal friendships. But he did not hesitate, and threw himself into the fight for Bryan in 1896 with as much zeal and enthusiasm as he had shown in the days of his early manhood when he had led his people in the struggle against negro and carpetbag rule in Virginia.

In the arena of national affairs Senator Daniel has been a commanding figure for a quarter of a century. On every subject of legislation which attracted anything like general attention he has taken position, and while, from the nature of things, he has been in the minority more frequently than with the majority, and has seen many measures he advocated defeated and many whose principles he opposed get on the statute-books, his views have never failed to receive the most respectful consideration at the hands of his adversaries and have impressed themselves to a greater or less degree upon legislation enacted by his opponents. When the Democrats were in power in the Senate during Mr. Cleveland's second administration Senator Daniel's influence was second to that of no other Senator. Earlier, in 1890, when the so-called "force bill," which proposed to deprive Southern States of the control of their elections, was being considered in the Senate and its passage seemed almost assured, it was the influence of Senator Daniel as much as that of any other man which brought about the agreement with the Republican leaders which resulted in the death of the measure. Senator Daniel himself, in discussing this episode in his career, always minimizes the part which he bore in defeating the "force bill," and ascribes chief credit to Senators Vest and Gorman on the Democratic side and Senator Quay of the Republicans. He votes himself second; his colleagues voted him first.

A less modest man than Senator Daniel would occupy a far more prominent place in the councils of his party. His dif-

fidence and dislike of "fuss and feathers" are proverbial. His home life, in Washington and in Lynchburg, reflect the simplicity and modesty of the man. Some of his dearest and closest friends wore the gray of the Confederate private soldier. A large portion of Senator Daniel's life has been devoted to work in behalf of unfortunate comrades of '61-5. He is a poor man, but no old soldier ever appealed to Senator Daniel for assistance and came away empty-handed.

It is thoroughly characteristic of the man that his warmest friends in the Senate are soldiers of the great war, without reference to whether they wore the blue or whether they fought in gray. Whenever a Union soldier Senator is trying to get through a measure in behalf of veterans of the Union army he always counts upon the active support of Senator Daniel and is never disappointed. For years William McKinley and Senator Daniel were warmest friends.

No Confederate soldier ever accepted in better faith the verdict rendered at Appomattox than did Senator Daniel. Every public utterance of his on occasions where the subject was in any way appropriate has been for the complete restoration of good feeling between the sections of a common country. Naturally, some of the most notable utterances of Senator Daniel have been in the form of tributes to the valor and devotion of the men of the South who fought and died for the truth as they were given to see it. But hardly less notable have been his tributes to the American soldier, whether fighting under the Stars and Stripes or the stars and bars, who stood ready to risk all and to surrender all for the sake of a principle. The writer has heard Senator Daniel say more than once that some of his dearest friends fought on the Union side, and that had he been born in Massachusetts, or New York, or Pennsylvania, probably he would have fought under Grant instead of under Lee.

"Patriotism is simply standing with one's people," remarked Senator Daniel to the writer some years ago. "Why did I enter the Confederate army? How much did I know about the great questions which the civil leaders of the two sections had been fighting out in the forum? Nothing. I simply felt the great movement of my people to repel the invasion of my State and went with them. I think the feeling which I had was the feeling which many thousands of others of my comrades had. They

were patriots, and I was not conscious of any but a patriotic motive."

Senator Daniel has never displayed aught but the loftiest courage, whether it were needed to hold him steady on the battlefield or to make him espouse a cause in time of peace. His splendid democracy impresses and appeals as does no other of his characteristics. It is unquestionably true that with a large section of Senator Daniel's party, in Virginia and elsewhere, the name of William Jennings Bryan is one to conjure with. Criticism of Mr. Bryan, opposition to any of his views, will endanger the political existence of even the most popular Democrat in many of the Southern States, yet for eight years Senator Daniel has not hesitated to withstand Mr. Bryan to his face in the discussion of a number of public questions. As a member of the committee on resolutions of the Democratic national convention at Kansas City, in 1904, Senator Daniel spent the night endeavoring to convince the committee that the issue of the free coinage of silver was no longer pressing. He lost, the platform reiterated the sixteen-to-one declaration made at Chicago four years before, and Mr. Bryan again led the party to defeat. In 1904, at St. Louis, Senator Daniel, as chairman of the committee, led such a fight against Mr. Bryan as no Democrat had ever dared to inaugurate against the Nebraska statesman. This time Senator Daniel's defeat was not so decided, but the national ticket went down under an unprecedented majority.

To many serious-thinking Democrats there is a chance to elect a Democrat to the Presidency with Senator Daniel leading the party. He is not a conservative in the sense that Mr. Fairbanks, or Speaker Cannon, or Senator Knox is a conservative, yet Senator Daniel is both a radical and a conservative. There is no man in public life who clings so strongly to the principles which have been tested and which have made the country great. He is like the general of an army who keeps his pioneer corps well in his front, but who never ventures his main column on unknown ground. Senator Daniel has found time in a busy life to study nearly every Governmental question which has arisen in our history. His intimates are often surprised to find that what was to them a new question was one upon which Senator Daniel had amassed information and taken a position long before.

"The Democratic campaign," said Senator Daniel, recently, "should be based upon the purpose of getting together the voters of the United States to assert the plain and simple Democratic creed that this is a Government of the people; that the highest and plainest duty of Government is to secure to the people equal rights, and to oppose all monopolies and special privileges.

"The tariff, transportation, the trusts, and centralization are the subjects of public interest and consideration. We need no new issues and no new Constitution of strained construction. Those who seek to invent new issues and new versions of the Constitution perplex and divert the minds of the people from substantial issues and just views that exist. It is principles and not "isms" that Democrats stand for; and if you take the compass of sound principle it will guide you through the tangles of contention.

"Real issues are made by the people themselves, and grow out of their necessities.

"Artificial issues are like artificial flowers, good for nothing except in the gaslight.

"The extreme question of State rights that came to the issue of battle has been long since settled," said Senator Daniel, "but as long as the United States is a federation of States, questions of Federal and State jurisdiction will continue to arise and will pass to the peaceful jurisdiction of the courts. Democracy has its fixed principle on the subject, and no one has better stated it than did Jefferson, in his first inaugural address, when he stood for, 'The support of the State Governments in all their rights as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, the surest bulwarks against our anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the general Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad.'"

Were Senator Daniel made President of the United States his administration might not compel the applause of thousands who love the spectacular; it would not shock thousands who believe that the quiet, orderly, unostentatious administration of Government is the best administration, and that bluster does not always betoken power.

WALTER EDWARD HARRIS.

JOSEPH WINGATE FOLK.

ERADICATE from the minds of men all empirical concepts of political philosophy and erase from the pages of history all grotesque political theories, all fanciful untried social schemes, all the vagaries that ever disturbed or threatened to disturb the peace or mar the happiness and security of mankind, all the radical doctrines that ever menaced the stability of free institutions or lowered upon the horizon of constitutional government, and the record made by Joseph Wingate Folk will still remain unaltered, undiminished and undisturbed; but strike out the page in which his record is written, and you will eliminate from the history of American politics an era.

For a quarter of a century before Folk entered the arena of public affairs, graft had been talked about. President Cleveland denounced "the commune of pelf." Ingalls of Kansas proclaimed that honesty in politics was "an iridescent dream." Here and there, at rare intervals, there had been sporadic efforts at reform. But, in the main, the rule of the boss was supreme.

In 1894 there came to St. Louis from the State of Tennessee a young lawyer, lately graduated from Vanderbilt University, and schooled in the best traditions of the South. He came of a race of lawyers, and his blood was of the old Virginia and Carolina stock. He was not a politician, but was reared in the statecraft of the old Southern school. He sought no political honors, but entered at once into the practice of his profession, confining his work to the civil courts. With those innate qualities of patience and indomitable diligence which have always been among his most admirable and distinctly individual traits, he followed his profession, looking for success in the only place where one ought to expect and may reasonably hope to find it, in the work immediately at hand. It was his rule in legal practice to accept no employment that he did not know to be absolutely honest; but once he took a cause in hand, no labor was too arduous and no sacrifice too great. And thus his clientage grew, and his fame became noised about the city. Here was a young attorney who was no dashing orator, no politician with a pull, but one who was learned in the law, diligent in his calling, and, withal, as true as the steel and as keen as the edge of the Saracen's blade; in short, a man who could be relied upon to do his duty.

At this juncture came the great St. Louis street-railway strike. The union needed counsel. But the union men did not hunt up a labor agitator; they did not seek out a politician with "influence." They wanted a man of courage, a man of ability, a man who enjoyed the absolute trust of all who knew him, and a man who would not betray a trust. They found Folk. After looking into the nature of the proposed employment he accepted it, and undertook to settle the strike. The great strike was settled in a manner pleasing to all parties, and Folk went back to his law office, to continue his patient, persistent plodding in behalf of other clients.

Then came the campaign of 1900. A small coterie of political bosses were naming a Democratic ticket for the city of St. Louis. One by one the offices were checked off as the names of the nominees were written down. When they came to the office of Circuit Attorney there was a pause. There was no available man. Then some one suggested Folk. He had settled the strike. Labor and capital were both grateful for this, surely; Folk was the man for the place. The young attorney was seen. He declined. He was building up a good law practice in an honorable way; city politics was notoriously dishonest and corrupt; he would have none of it. But the bosses insisted. Folk began to hesitate. Finally he said, "Yes, I will accept the nomination—but if elected I shall obey my oath of office." The bosses heeded not the remark. Perhaps, thought they, the young lawyer was only seeking to save appearances. At any rate, what was an oath of office in a city where bribery had so long been, as an attorney for some of the hoodlums afterwards declared, "merely a conventional offence"? How well Folk obeyed his oath of office they soon learned, and the world now knows the story.

Immediately after the election, cries of fraud were current. But so had it been for a quarter of a century, after every election. No one paid much attention to the charges—excepting Circuit Attorney Folk. He listened; he heard the complaints; he investigated. Indictments were found against a number of persons, charging them with election frauds. An angry face greeted the Circuit Attorney in his office. "These men are my friends," it said; "I made you Circuit Attorney; I nominated you and I elected you. What do you mean by this?" Folk turned upon him the clear, deep, earnest eyes that afterwards so often struck

terror into the hearts of the corruptionists who appeared before the St. Louis grand jury, and calmly said: "I simply mean to do as I said—to obey my oath of office." This was the beginning of the great struggle which has since been re-echoed in nearly every great city of the United States.

The bosses declared that they would destroy him; they would make an example of him, for the guidance of all such impertinent prosecutors who should chance to arise in the future. All through his term of office he was hounded, vilified and slandered by such a torrent of malicious lies as seldom falls upon a single human head. His life was often threatened. All the wealth, power and shrewdness that graft and craft could summon to the onset were brought into play against him. But he kept up the fight, and won. The story has been too often told to need rehearsal here. Let it now suffice to say that at the end of Folk's four years he had convicted more boodlers than were ever before convicted by any single prosecuting officer in the world's history, and had laid bare more official venality than was ever before revealed at any one time and place.

The great civic awakening in St. Louis soon spread throughout Missouri, and it has since spread throughout the Union. Folk's subsequent candidacy for the Democratic nomination for Governor was the necessary and legitimate response to a natural and resistless popular demand. Then came the most spectacular political campaign in the annals of Missouri. In opposition to Folk, all officialdom stood as a stone wall. With but few exceptions, every official in the State, from the highest to the lowest, from Governor down to township constable, including the professional politicians, leaders and party managers of high and low degree, all were solidly aligned against Folk. But back of all the opposition to Folk stood the political corruptionist, the gambler, the crook, the wine-room roué and the debauchee, with exhaustless wealth, boundless experience and unlimited nerve, fighting desperately and as only entrenched corruption knows how to fight, for existence. Against this appalling array stood Folk, unappalled. He hurled against them the challenge to mortal combat. It was a fight to the finish. He went forth single-handed and alone, but was soon cheered on by the plaudits of three millions of Missourians. Party leaders were stunned by the onslaught; it was not a rebellion, but a revolu-

tion. Long before the convention met all open opposition to Folk had broken down, and his nomination was practically unanimous. In the ensuing canvass preceding the general election of 1904 the lawless elements concentrated their whole fight against Folk. But Folk alone, of the entire Democratic State ticket, was elected, his plurality being more than thirty thousand. He ran fifty thousand votes ahead of others on his ticket who were not fought as he was fought by the corruptionists.

During his administration as Governor he has continued to take his oath of office seriously. He was the first Governor of Missouri to enforce the laws requiring the closing of saloons on Sunday. In Missouri, as in most other States, before Folk's entry into the executive office, there had been no effort to enforce the Sunday dramshop law in the large cities of the State, where the Governor, through his police commissioners, has practically unlimited power to do so. But Folk enforced the law, and the result has been a noticeable decrease in the aggregate of Sunday crime and a perceptible saving in criminal costs. But this step aroused the brewing interests against him, and the combined liquor interests now constitute the bulwark of whatever opposition to Folk still exists in Missouri.

Chief among the scores of good laws enacted in response to the recommendations of the present Governor of Missouri are the anti-race-track gambling law, which put the most powerful gambling syndicate in the country out of business; a law making the operation of bucket-shops a felony; a general State primary election law, giving each voter in the State the right of a secret ballot in the choice of all party nominees; a law providing for the regulation of rates charged by public-service corporations, which had theretofore been permitted to charge whatsoever they pleased; a "derelict official" law, providing for the removal of public officials who fail to do their duty; a two-cent railway passenger fare law; factory inspection, child labor and pure food laws; an eight months compulsory school law, and a new road law providing for highway engineers, and designed to place highway construction in Missouri on a scientific basis. While these are but a few of the scores of good measures attributable to the influence of Governor Folk, they serve to mark out the broad scope of his work and to illustrate his deep interest alike in the moral, political, educational and material welfare of his State.

Indeed, so numerous are his public services that the student of his work will be tempted to say, as Macaulay said of Bacon: "Turn where we will, the trophies of that mighty intellect are full in view: we are judging Manlius in sight of the Capitol."

Taken all in all, the record made by Governor Folk may be said to fairly meet the famous standard set by Edmund Burke: "A disposition to preserve, and an ability to improve, taken together, would be my standard of a statesman." While Folk's legislative record shows him to be possessed in a remarkable degree of the faculties of constructive statesmanship, and while he has shown an eminently progressive spirit in dealing with new problems as they have come before him for solution, yet his genius is, upon the whole, profoundly conservative. He expressed it in his New York address of welcome to Bryan: "In this epoch, so important to American liberty, we ask the people to set up no new gods; we ask them to follow no new paths which may lead into the quicksands of dishonor and despair. Our safest and surest guide is still the old maxim, that there shall be 'equal rights to all; special privileges to none.'" He expressed it again elsewhere when he said: "Let us be conservative in charging wrong-doing; but, once sure of the wrong, let us be radical in its extermination."

His official record presents an inspiring example of devotion to the Constitution and the laws. No American of equal fame has ever been more free from that un-American taint, the appeal to class. He knows but one Constitution—the document as it came from the hands of its makers. He knows but one code—the laws as they are written, not for the rich, nor for the poor, nor for labor nor capital, but for all alike. It has been his high privilege to vindicate the Constitution and the laws with such wisdom, with such matchless courage and with such distinguished fidelity, that everywhere the name of Folk is known it is known as a synonym for law-enforcement. He appealed to his native city to strike off the shackles of the boss; and every great city has echoed the call. He touched the public conscience, and it was awakened, as from a sleep. He brought no new doctrine, unless the doctrine of common honesty in public life was new. He offered no new theories, unless the principle of obedience to law was new. But where the sovereignty of the State was trampled upon he lifted it up, and where the law was a dead

letter he made it alive. Multitudes who had lost faith in laws which were made only to be disregarded, and in a government which could make laws but not enforce them, have found in Folk's record a proof, a promise and a prophecy that a government of, by and for the people shall not perish. He is known by his works; more distinctly so, perhaps, than any other American of equal reputation. His career has been one rather of performances than promises; of deeds rather than words. Like Jefferson, he trusts the people implicitly, and they have not deceived him; and like Jefferson again, he is implicitly trusted by the people in return.

THOMAS SPEED MOSBY.

GEORGE GRAY.

"WHO will best lead the Democratic hosts in the impending struggle for the restoration of honest government and the constitutional rights of the States and of their people?" These words were used by Judge Gray when, at the Democratic National Convention in Cincinnati in 1880, he placed his fellow Delawarean, the late Thomas F. Bayard, in nomination for the Presidency. To-day the question may well be asked in these same words, and the name given in answer would be that of George Gray, of Delaware.

The people of the United States have before them to-day the rare and wholesome example of the office seeking the man, and in this case a man of peculiar and eminent qualifications for the position. Of the many candidates now about to be presented by both the great political parties for the coming conventions to pass upon, no one has had the experience and training which should qualify the nominee of either great party such as Judge Gray has had, and no one who has held office at the gift of the people has rendered a finer or more conscientious account of his stewardship.

Born in Delaware some sixty-odd years ago, of Revolutionary stock, Mr. Gray exemplifies those sturdy traits of ability and integrity which so well mark the men who, through the stress of the Revolutionary War and the adoption of the Federal Constitution, gave all of their best for the cause to which they were pledged. He entered Princeton College in 1857 as a Junior, and

graduated two years later with high honors; thereafter he studied law partly at the Harvard Law School and partly in the office of his father, the late Andrew C. Gray, and was admitted to the Delaware bar in 1863. His first public office was that of Attorney-General for the State of Delaware, to which he was appointed by Governor Hall in 1879, and again reappointed by Governor Stockley in 1884. His record as Attorney-General was not only a matter of pride to his friends and admirers, but to all citizens of the State regardless of party, and the learning and abilities which he displayed readily led to his appointment as United States Senator from Delaware in 1885, to succeed Mr. Bayard, who had just entered Mr. Cleveland's first cabinet, and his election in 1887 and re-election in 1893. Immediately upon his entry into the United States Senate he became not only one of the leaders on the Democratic side, but a power in the National Legislature in assisting to pass laws for the benefit of the whole people, and in opposing measures which tended towards centralization of power and class interests. His well-remembered fight in opposition to the so-called "force bill" in 1892 can never be forgotten by true lovers of civil liberty in this country; and to the Southern States, whose cause he then represented, his name must ever be recalled with peculiar affection and loyalty. And his well-known attitude in regard to the tariff is best exemplified in his own words as spoken on the floor of the Senate in 1886, as follows: "What right has the Government to go into partnership with people who are engaged in one industry to the detriment of those engaged in another? What sort of conception of government is that which allows the hand of governmental power to go down into my pocket to take out the dollar there, not for the purpose of putting it into the treasury of the nation, but to transfer it to the pocket of another? Against this monstrous claim of power I have been protesting during all my political life. No class of our people have so suffered from the exercise of this power as the farmers of our country. Compelled to sell in an open market, and to buy in a protected one, they have borne upon their bowed backs for many years the burden of a protective tariff. I have no public ambition greater than that I may be permitted in some humble way to aid in removing some portion at least of that burden." And his position on the subject of "trusts" as recently expressed, to the effect that the passage and

administration of law in restraint and regulation thereof should be directed towards the individuals who operate them, is too well known to require further comment. That he is opposed to centralization is no better exemplified than in his own words, when he says: "The danger of this centralizing sentiment is that it appeals to the selfishness of human nature and to the willingness to be relieved of the burdens and responsibilities of self-government. But I am persuaded that the prevailing sentiment of the American people does not favor the exchange of our self-governed communities and the individual liberty that they foster for the paternalism of a national Government, which suppresses the one and must, in the nature of things, tend to extinguish the other. . . .

"I do not believe in centralization. It would seem that, having survived through more than a century, our dual scheme of government has passed the experimental stage, and was destined to rest for generations to come on the foundations upon which it was erected. We cannot, however, close our eyes to present-day conditions, which, if they do not now seriously menace the permanence of our constitutional scheme, at least should challenge serious thought." In 1898, President McKinley appointed him a member of the Canadian Joint High Commission, in connection with which he rendered well-known and eminent services, and later, at the close of the Spanish War, he was appointed a member of the Paris Peace Commission, and after his return was largely instrumental in securing the ratification of the Spanish Treaty by the Senate. After the close of his term as Senator he was appointed United States Circuit Judge, and has since occupied this position upon the bench with an increasing reputation for fair-mindedness and high order of ability.

When the whole country was shocked at the strife of the miners and operators in the anthracite regions, Judge Gray was appointed at the head of the commission to arbitrate their differences, and so just and able were the findings of the commission in which he was so largely instrumental that to-day his name is a beloved household word among all the coal miners of the country and a synonym for fairness and justice with all employers of labor. The coal strikes threatened or occurring since the anthracite strike in 1903 which have been referred to him as arbitrator have passed off so quietly and successfully that we are

not apt, in the busy rush of to-day, to notice the vast accomplishment of the powers of one man to satisfy both parties to such harsh controversies. And perhaps, but for the fact that the daily papers had noticed the reference to him as arbitrator of the differences between the operators and the miners, the public at large would hardly have known of the great and lasting good he was doing for all the people. And growing out of this series of arbitrations we must not forget his words in an address delivered before the miners in Pennsylvania, wherein he said: "It is individual liberty—not class liberty, not corporation liberty, not guild or society liberty—that our fathers fought for and established on this great continent. The right to your home; the right to go and come; the right to worship God according to the dictates of your own conscience; the right to work or not to work, and the right to be exempt from interference by others in the enjoyment of those rights; the right to be exempt from tyranny of one man or of a few; the right to so live that no man or set of men shall work his or their will on you against your consent. This is liberty worth living for. It is liberty worth dying for. And it was this blessed inheritance that has come to us from the fathers and which means to us all that it meant to them. While it is maintained all things are possible that tend to the expansion, the development, prosperity and glory of our common country. Under the folds of our dear flag I fondly believe this liberty will live forever among us. That is what our flag means to us, and that, as it floats over the land and over the sea, is its message that it delivers to all of the toiling millions in other lands."

Judge Gray, by reason of the pre-eminent ability which he has shown in the many public offices which he has been called upon to fill, is now well known to the whole people of this country, regardless of party, and while his name was presented at the National Democratic Convention in 1904, the circumstances leading to Mr. Parker's nomination were too strong to permit any show of success for Judge Gray. But to-day, when every one, regardless of party, is looking for a man to whom the high office of President can most safely be entrusted, many Republicans as well as Democrats find in him the man of their real choice. The resolutions adopted by the Democratic State Central Committee of Delaware in December last state: "The Democratic State Central Committee of Delaware desires to call the attention of

Democrats to Judge George Gray, whom we believe to be the most available man for the Presidential nomination. It is known that Judge Gray is not personally desirous of being a candidate for this great office, but we believe that if nominated he would lead his party to victory at the polls, and if elected he would make a great, wise and good President. Therefore, not to gratify Judge Gray, and not in accordance with his wishes, but to promote the welfare of our party and country, we conceive it to be our duty to urge his nomination upon the consideration of fellow Democrats in our sister States." And the resolutions instructing the Delaware delegation to work and vote for him at the coming Democratic National Convention include these words: "The time has come when the Democratic party needs a national victory. The welfare of the nation also demands a Democratic victory. In George Gray we have a Democrat in whom all classes of our voters and all of the conflicting interests have perfect confidence. The great bodies of wage-earners and the rank and file of men engaged in larger business enterprises would alike be glad to accept and support him, knowing that the rights of each and all would be equally protected by him.

"For the reasons we have indicated, we, his neighbors, knowing his great attainments, his sound and just judgment, his civic courage and his pure patriotism, commend his name to the Democrats of the nation as the man best fitted to lead the party in the coming campaign and to conduct the affairs of government in the event of Democratic victory."

With such a man as its standard-bearer surely the Democratic party can go into the coming campaign with every prospect of success. For not only does Judge Gray represent in their best sense the principles of true Democracy, but also the principles which all true lovers of our national Union believe in.

THOMAS F. BAYARD.

JUDSON HARMON.

IF the history of half a century past is to be taken as a guide, a successful Democratic candidate for the Presidency must come from a State torn with factional dissension, and must show among his credentials strong opposition at home. Even a candidate at other times invincible, if nominated with the unanimous endorse-

ment of his own State, becomes temporarily clothed with the attribute of vincibility.

One of the four or five men who have been most discussed throughout the country will not be presented for the nomination by his own State at the Denver convention. Yet after a hard contest he has become the party's candidate for Governor of Ohio.

The peculiar constitution of the Senate, and its present overwhelming Republican majority, make the enactment of any party legislation during the term of the next President an impossibility if he be a Democrat. Any change in the Federal statute-book will be non-partisan in character. So far as he affects the policy of the country without first securing the consent of his political adversaries, it will be by his method of enforcement of laws already existing. But if as an executive he concentrates the attention and commands the approval of the nation, he will establish his party as well as himself in the public confidence, and eventually bring the party into an effective working majority in both branches of the national Legislature. Circumstances beyond its control will force the Democratic party, if entrusted with the executive power for the next four years, into a position of conservatism. It will not be devising new laws, but seeking what may be accomplished with the laws that we have now. In selecting its candidate it may wisely seek for a man who is not only an administrator of proved capacity, but also experienced in the workings of the great organism by which the public business of the nation is done; in other words, for a man who has won distinction in a Cabinet position. That is one of the reasons for the prominence which has been given to the name of the last Democratic Attorney-General of the United States.

No man becomes President of the French Republic, or Prime Minister of France or of Great Britain, without previous experience in a Cabinet position. Our earlier tradition was the same; and while since the days of national conventions the man of Federal executive experience has had less advantage over the military hero, the favorite son and the dark horse, yet Van Buren, Clay, Cass, Buchanan, Bell, Grant and Blaine, like Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Adams, Crawford and Calhoun, were nominated from among men who had had Cabinet experience, while Roosevelt's knowledge of practical statecraft was gained in subordinate Federal positions at Washington. For the purpose

of familiarizing its occupant with the whole machinery of the Federal Government no office below the Presidency is superior, perhaps none equal, to that of the Attorney-General. For he, besides controlling his own department, is the legal adviser, and therefore in a large sense necessarily the general adviser, of the President and of the other members of the Cabinet.

Judson Harmon was born in Ohio on February 3rd, 1846. His father was a Baptist minister. He was graduated at Denison College, an educational institution of that denomination, at the age of twenty. He was a baseball-player there, and is an athlete still. Twice as a boy, when his native State was threatened with invasion, he joined volunteer organizations hastily formed for its defence. At seventeen (to use his own words), when Morgan crossed the State on his famous raid, "I joined a volunteer company of cavalry and pursued him; at least, he travelled rapidly ahead of us and in the same direction for some days." In 1869 he was admitted to the bar and settled in Cincinnati. After seven years of active practice, he was elected Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Hamilton County, but was unseated by a Republican Legislature after a few months of service. His popularity and brilliant qualities, and his eminent fitness for judicial office, led to his election by very large majorities in 1878, and again in 1883, to the bench of the Superior Court of Cincinnati, a tribunal famous for the large number of distinguished men who have been among its members. Soon after his election he was joined by Joseph B. Foraker, who after short judicial service went back into active politics and became the Governor of the State. The reputation which Harmon made for himself as a judge, as is so commonly the case, deprived the community of his judicial services. Early in 1887 George Hoadly, one of the leaders of the bar of the United States, removed from Cincinnati to New York, and his partners invited Judge Harmon to resign and fill the vacancy in their firm. Harmon accordingly tendered his resignation to Governor Foraker, who appointed as his successor William H. Taft. For a little more than eight years, as one of the recognized leaders of the Cincinnati bar and head of a law firm having wide business connections, Judge Harmon was out of public life. Then President Cleveland appointed him Attorney-General of the United States to succeed Richard Olney, upon the latter's promotion to the office of Secretary of State.

The efficiency of Judge Harmon's administration of the Attorney-Generalship, which he held from June 8th, 1895, to March 3rd, 1897, was conceded. It was a period when great administrative ability was needed in all the departments of the Government, and was found there: the close of the lean years of bad crops and financial fallacies, when the country was recovering from the legislative extravagances and follies of 1890, and being put upon the firm foundation that has supported the extravagance and imperialism of the past decade. Space forbids discussing more than one feature of his work. That which is now of most public interest is probably the establishment of the Federal power to deal with corporate aggression under the commerce clause of the Constitution. Among the biographers of Republican Presidential candidates in the May number of this REVIEW, one claims that this power was a "new idea" of his own hero (an Attorney-General of later days), quoting in support no less an authority than the present President; and, indeed, the claim contributed considerably to the marvellous combination of history, mythology, prophecy, politics and cash by which the great popular majority of 1904 was rolled up. But the "new idea" had been long before propounded in a statute of disputed authorship, passed by non-partisan vote, known as the Sherman Anti-Trust Law of 1890; and its enforceability was first and for all time demonstrated by Judson Harmon.

When he took office the judicial decisions had been so adverse that the general opinion of the bar had pronounced the law impracticable of enforcement. The only case that had been pending long enough to reach the highest tribunal before the administration should come to an end was the so-called Trans-Missouri case, which had been commenced by the Harrison administration, but had been unsuccessful in both the lower courts. It had been let drag in hopes of finding one more advantageous to the Government to make a test of, but in default of a better, Attorney-General Harmon took it up. He briefed and argued it himself against an array of the ablest lawyers whom the companies could bring together, put behind it the whole force of his intellect and personality, and won it by a vote of five to four, establishing the constitutionality of the law and its enforceability against a combination of railroad corporations.

To Secretary Taft, as his biographer claims, belongs the fame

of writing the first judicial opinion sustaining a suit under the Anti-Trust Law against a combination of industrial corporations; but the suit was brought by Attorney-General Harmon. This was the Addyston Pipe case, commenced late in 1896, when evidence long vainly sought came suddenly into the hands of the department, and so rapidly pushed through its earlier stages as to be in shape for argument at the appellate tribunal within three months after the Cleveland administration ended. The Joint Traffic Association case was also commenced and carried through the first two courts during Judge Harmon's term, and its ultimate success was made possible by the Supreme Court decision in the Trans-Missouri suit. That decision was not handed down until just two weeks after his retirement to private life; but the original work, the difficult work of construing and establishing the law, had been then already done. Early in his term the House of Representatives asked him what further legislation was necessary in his opinion. He answered, indicating certain amendments which would make the law effective, and saying that if he was to conduct investigations as to its violation he must be provided with a liberal appropriation for that purpose. On November 30th, 1896, he repeated his recommendations in submitting his annual report to Congress, and again called attention to the fact that his fund was "wholly inadequate." The Republican Congress preferred that the trusts and conspiracies should flourish, rather than that so energetic a Democratic official should receive needed assistance in curbing them.

Among the amendments thus proposed by Attorney-General Harmon to the Anti-Trust Law was one which would probably have been more effective than any that have received the endorsement of the present administration. He proposed to insert that terror to evil-doers, a clause casting upon the defendants the burden of proof as to matters peculiarly within their own knowledge. To the same effective weapon he appealed when retained with Mr. Frederick N. Judson of St. Louis, some years later, as special counsel for the Government for the punishment of unlawful rebates granted to certain shippers of coal by the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé Railway Company. The so-called Elkins laws of 1903 had taken away the penalty of imprisonment in criminal proceedings, but before the rebates an injunction order had been issued, of which if valid they constituted a violation.

The then Attorney-General concurred with the special counsel in regarding the order as valid. The latter recommended that the railroad "and all its principal officers and agents who had during the period above named or any part thereof power and authority over traffic agreements and freight rates, be arraigned for contempt of court." But the Attorney-General, after consulting the President, took the position that the granting of rebates by a railroad company, although upon an enormous scale and to a shipper of great power and wealth, affords no sufficient presumption that the traffic officers of the company knew or suspected what was going on. Messrs. Harmon and Judson then withdrew from the case, saying, "The violation by a corporation of an injunction directed against it and its officers always calls for a rule against such of them as had control of its conduct to show cause why they should not be held personally responsible. They are *prima facie* guilty of disobedience. It was their duty to see that the acts forbidden were not done, as well as not to do them. . . The action of the corporation is necessarily presumptive evidence against its principal officers who had charge of the department in question. . . . What we have said is peculiarly true of the great corporations of our day. They cannot be imprisoned, and punishment by fine is not only inadequate, but reaches the real culprits only lightly, if at all. The evils with which we are now confronted are corporate in name but individual in fact. Guilt is always personal. So long as officials can hide behind their corporations, no remedy can be effective. When the Government searches out the guilty men, and makes corporate wrong-doing mean personal punishment and dishonor, the laws will be obeyed." The nomination of Harmon would be the adoption of his theory of how to deal with corporate abuse and corporate crime.

Except for that one abortive retainer, Judge Harmon has been out of public life since March 3rd, 1897. His career has been as a leader in court, as an adviser in important business transactions, and as an arbitrator of important controversies. The reputation which he made as a business executive at Washington he has increased by his skilful management of insolvent railroad corporations. In 1899 he was appointed receiver of the Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railway Company, and remained in office for about a year. In 1905 he was appointed by

Judge Lurton, upon consent of all parties, as receiver of three railroads, the Père Marquette, Toledo Railway & Terminal, and Cincinnati, Hamilton & Dayton, having in all 3,500 miles of road and 18,000 employees. The last named is still in his hands. Upon taking charge, he declared his belief that a railroad could be fairly and honestly managed according to law without losing its business, and that this was exactly what he proposed to undertake to show. The employees and patrons of the roads are the witnesses to his success.

EDWARD B. WHITNEY.

JOHN A. JOHNSON

IN selecting the candidate of a political party two considerations should be kept in view. The candidate must first be worthy and, second, available, or likely to be elected. No candidate should ever be considered who does not possess the first attribute and if the inquiry were to end there it would not be at all difficult to make a selection. When the second element is sought to be combined with the first, greater difficulties arise.

There are many well-meaning people who seem to consider that it is evidence of venality or at least of a lack of high ideals to pay any regard to the practical side of politics, and yet, if one believes that the success of his party is essential to or even desirable for the best interests of the country it becomes his duty by all honorable means, which must also be practical means, to secure that success. "A glorious defeat" is often beneficial to an individual or a party, but a series of defeats inevitably results in disaster. Idealists have rocked the world, but those who have rocked it for the best results have combined the enthusiasm of the idealists with practical common sense. Peter the Hermit preaching the Crusades did not advocate sending children or unarmed men to Palestine. Columbus did not imagine he could prove the truth of his claims by trying to swim the ocean.

Again, the availability of any particular man depends upon existing conditions at the time his claims are being considered. General Grant, who seems to have been devoid of the slightest approach to vindictiveness, made an admirable President immediately following the Civil War, but no one believes that his training, accomplishments or disposition would have fitted him to cope with the problems of to-day.

The state of the public mind in this country at the present time must be taken into consideration. Almost overnight there has come the belief that American ideals have been lost; that a few have sequestered the wealth which should belong to many and no one is now so sure of an audience as he who accuses some one of "grafting."

The Republican party, through whose protective tariff this condition has been produced, finds its leader the fiercest in denouncing present conditions, while the lesser lights of the organization sigh for the good old days of peace and large profits.

The attitude of the Democratic party for many years past has been most unfortunate. Man is a progressive animal and the American man is both impatient and progressive, but the last three platforms of the party might be epitomized in the words "come back," and so while we have contented ourselves with mumbling, "The old days were better than the new," President Roosevelt has taken up the Sherman anti-trust law, discarded by a Democratic administration as worthless, and at least has convinced the people that there is something moving, moving to the great satisfaction of some and to the dismay of others, but all are conscious of the motion.

The situation presents an opportunity for the party and for the man. What is required in a Chief Magistrate at this time is honest purpose, intelligence, knowledge of affairs, calm, deliberate judgment and cool, serene courage, the courage to refrain from catering to extreme fanatics as well as the courage to stay the spoiler's hand, no matter whose it may be; withal he should be a constructive statesman, for we are in a period of transition. The people have been so eager to foster great enterprises, that they gladly went on their knees to public service corporations, and it is not surprising that now when they attempt to reverse the position a heavy hand, not unlike the "dead hand" of English history, seeks to prevent them from rising. Let us pray with Carlyle that the readjustment come not "In a horror of great darkness, and shakings of the world and a cup of trembling which all nations shall drink."

These are severe tests by which to judge any candidate, but apply each in turn to John A. Johnson, the present Governor of Minnesota, and it is remarkable how the operation reveals his peculiar fitness as a candidate for the Presidency.

Governor Johnson was born in Minnesota of Swedish parents about forty-seven years ago and has under peculiarly adverse circumstances fought his way to his present position. He has been newspaper editor, Captain of Militia and State Senator, bearing himself modestly and indeed, as he still does, with an utter lack of self-consciousness. It was not until he became Governor that even the people of his native State recognized his really great qualities. It is true he assumed the duties of that office with a personal record free from taint or blemish, with the respect and kindly regard of all who knew him, but from that time on he became, as the Democratic Governor of a Republican State, a marked and closely watched man.

The Western people, as a rule, are not intensely partisan, and this is particularly true in Minnesota, where honest effort by public officers meets with a quick response. The Legislature and the other executive officers of the State, although belonging to a different party from the Governor, accorded him cordial support, and under the inspiration of his example and advice reform after reform has been introduced, the public business transacted with an alertness and despatch hitherto unknown, until now it can be said that Minnesota is one of the best-governed States in the Union. And all this has been done in so direct, simple and yet kindly a way that love for the Governor's personality has kept pace with admiration for his ability and character, so that if he were to be a candidate for re-election this year there would be no doubt of his success.

It must not be understood, however, that during the three years Mr. Johnson has been Governor he has had no encounter with "the interests"; upon the contrary, he has met and overthrown or brought to terms almost every large interest in the State. Timber trespassers, thieving insurance officials, tax dodgers and powerful railroad officials have successively been unhorsed by his lance and in such a way as to remind one of Scott's description of the "Gentle and glorious passage of arms at Ashby."

To illustrate: At the convening of the Legislature of 1907, the liquor interests feared the passage of a law granting local option to the counties of the State. The leading brewer sought an interview with Governor Johnson and asked him what he would do if such a bill was enacted. The reply was instantaneous: "Such a measure is peculiarly within the sound discretion

of the Legislators and no Governor would be justified in vetoing it; if the bill passes the Legislature I will approve it and so would you if you were Governor." "I guess that's so," returned the caller and the interview ended, but with no animosity rankling in the heart of the man whose interests were likely to be affected, because perforce he recognized the frankness and honesty of the public official who proposed to simply perform his duty.

This same unostentatious method of going directly to the heart of a situation was shown in the Governor's conduct during the great strike last summer in the iron mines, in which some seventeen thousand miners were involved. At once the usual demand for troops was made by the Steel Trust; instead, Mr. Johnson went himself to the scene of the strike, gave definite and precise interpretation to the respective rights of the parties, convinced both sides that he was not only impartial, but prepared and determined to carry out the law and preserve the peace, and the strike passed into history with a record of less disorder than would have occurred in the affected region under normal conditions in the same length of time.

In making appointments to office, Governor Johnson has selected men of the highest standing regardless of political effect, and his appointments to the bench, to the regency of the University, to the tax commission, as well as all other departments, demonstrate his independence and singleness of purpose. His subordinates have always realized this, for whenever a question of policy has arisen, the final instructions of the Governor have always been to follow the law regardless of the political effect.

John A. Johnson is the most available candidate the Denver Convention could select. He has made it eminently respectable to be a Democrat in Minnesota, and if he were the candidate of the party for President he would accomplish the same result in Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, the two Dakotas, Colorado, Oregon, Washington and perhaps Illinois, New York and the New England States. He has so many elements of strength that it is impossible to analyze them all within the limits of such an article as this, but a Democrat in the prime of life who has succeeded in everything he has undertaken, who as Governor of one of the great progressive States has compelled the love of his party and the admiration of his opponents, who has in his private or public life nothing to explain or apologize for, and who by reason of his

residence, antecedents, race and personality gives the very highest promise of success—must be considered most available.

THOMAS D. O'BRIEN.

HENRY WATTERSON.

HENRY WATTERSON, of Kentucky, holds a distinctive and distinguished place in the politics and journalism of the time. He is, and has been for thirty years, the most widely quoted newspaper writer of the country. Until the Free Silver Movement of 1896, he stood to the Democratic party in the same relation which Horace Greeley had borne to the Republican party until 1872, when Greeley became the Democratic nominee for President, but, unlike Greeley, Watterson did not sever his party relations in 1896. He is still a Democrat, and, although he has consistently declined to accept office, his friends believe that, if he were nominated for President, he would bring to the campaign and election an independent following such as no other candidate could command.

Mr. James Gordon Bennett, and the late Mr. John W. Mackay, never wearied of recounting his availability and his virtues. Since 1888, the New York "Herald" has each four years put him forward as the one Southern leader who could unite the two sections of the Union. It is certain that he is the only Southerner whose record could stand before the close, critical inspection of the North.

He came out of the Civil War thoroughly reconstructed, having gone into it reluctantly, opposed to slavery and secession, but going with his State, which was at that time Tennessee. He might be called "the great pacificator," for he antedated all others, except General Grant, in his appeals for sectional reconciliation, accepting and describing the three last amendments to the Constitution as, "The Treaty of Peace between the North and the South," passing to and fro between the two hostile political camps preaching justice to the negroes by the people of the South and justice to the South by the people of the North, and preparing the field for such sowers as Lamar and Grady, who came long after, the one his close associate and friend, the other his professed pupil and disciple.

He fought Greenbackism, and all forms of fiat money, against

the united sentiment of the West and South, and twenty years later gave up an undisputed leadership to fight Free Silver. His cable message from Geneva in the latter year, "No compromise with dishonor," rang like a bugle note and gave the signal for Sound Money Democracy.

From 1872 to 1892, he either wrote or dominated the National Platforms of his party, a leading figure in its National Conventions. He was the author of the Democratic Tariff Policy embraced by the demand for "A Tariff for Revenue Only," which he incorporated in the Platform of 1876, having been as early as 1872, with David A. Wells, the most earnest and aggressive assailant of the Protective System, the *beau sabreur* of the Free Traders as Wells was their Heavy Artillerist. At Chicago in 1892, he changed the Platform agreed upon in Committee, in open Convention, by a two-thirds vote. He is likewise the author of the slogan, "Back to the Constitution."

Mr. Watterson was the confidential friend and lieutenant of Mr. Tilden, presiding over the National Convention that nominated him for President and accepting a seat in Congress solely on Mr. Tilden's insistence, that great man desiring, as he said, "A personal representative on the floor of the House during the counting of the Electoral Vote." As recognition of his party standing he was placed on the Ways and Means Committee and was the most influential member of the Joint Democratic Steering Committee made up of six Senators and eight Representatives. He opposed the Electoral Commission Bill in Committee, but supported both the Bill and its ultimate findings in the House. During all these high party times no word that could be called sectional—that was not broadly national—fell from his tongue or pen. Such a line of antecedents can be presented by no other Democrat—certainly by no other Southern Democrat—and the friends of Mr. Watterson think that, submitted to the people, along with great oratorical talent and a most attractive personality, his candidacy, carrying with it a united South, would as surely carry the independent vote and draw from the more liberal Republicans a larger diversion than could be hoped for by any other Democrat.

Mr. Watterson's attitude on the Negro Question would insure him the bulk of the colored vote of the North, for late and early he has stood for the elevation and education of the black people

of the South, fighting their battles when it was not, in Kentucky, even physically safe to fight them.

The non-partisan demonstration which he recently encountered, when, after thirty years of absence, he appeared on the floor of the Hall of Representatives at Washington, is cited in proof of his extraordinary personal popularity. Both sides of the House rose and cheered him to the echo, Republicans vying with Democrats to do him honor.

But Mr. Watterson has steadfastly refused to stand for office. Declining to allow himself to be voted for as United States Senator for Kentucky, not long ago, he said :

" . . . It may not be improper, or irrelevant, for me to repeat, what I have often declared, that if a certificate of election were placed in my hand I would not go to Washington to take the oath of office. If I had wanted that sort of thing I would have sought it thirty years ago, when, as a young man, I stood in the line of succession and all the ways were open to me.

" I was born and grew up in the National Capital. I was brought into too close touch with the ups and downs, particularly the 'downs,' of political life to be enamoured of it. In point of fact, I knew too familiarly too many poor great men, their servitude, their disappointments and their sorrows. I early resolved that if I ever gained a footing in my chosen profession I would not follow the fatal examples of Greeley, Raymond and Forney, but would pursue my destiny as ever a free man and never a slave whosoever it might lead me, hewing to the line, leaving the chips to fall as it pleased God and Truth. From that resolution I have never swerved. . . .

" I not only want no preferment, but I protest against newspaper nominations to office which imply that journalism is not an eminently honorable Department of the Public Service. The journalist who has his weather eye fixed upon office cannot be a disinterested journalist, and disinterestedness is the soul of journalism. Men in their places are the men who stand; not self-seeking aspirants dazzled by the glitter of the foot-lights of Washington.

" Success in public life means preparation as much as success in professional life. No man is born to it. Experience, special training, aptitude, no less than ability and learning and eloquence, lie at the foundation of a career in statesmanship, and whilst all these great qualities might exist in a journalist, they would not necessarily fit the wearer to shine upon the scene of another stage of action. Mr. Greeley, Mr. Raymond and Mr. Forney paid the penalty for the mistake of mixing journalism and officialism with shipwrecked lives and broken hearts. As I said in the outset, I early made up my mind never to follow in their footsteps.

" I am profoundly grateful for the good-will of my professional brethren.

But I cannot help feeling a kind of resentment that they should think office a 'promotion' and call it a 'reward.' It is rather a badge of servitude. For all dignities my respect is reverend; of the Army and the Navy, of the Senate and the Church; but there is also a dignity in duty done for its own sake, in pride of profession for its own sake; and this dignity cannot be enhanced by any blue ribbon or titular distinction."

It is believed by Mr. Watterson's friends that good Presidents are made of just such stuff, and they point to their favorite's long familiarity with affairs—a Doctrinaire among Statesmen and a Statesman among Doctrinaires, as John Russell Young once aptly described him—his intimate knowledge of men and measures of his time—his sturdy independence—his orthodox Democracy of the School of Jefferson and Tilden—his sound record on every national question—as not only eminently fitting him for the office of President, but as going to the making of a vote-catching candidacy in case the managing politicians, with whom he has never been a favorite, except during doubtful campaigns, felt themselves compelled to take a Southerner as their standard-bearer.

For nearly forty years Mr. Watterson has represented the best thought of the South. He has stood by his convictions with a devotion that has known no rest, and a courage which would not yield an inch to sectionalism or partyism where these seemed to him in the wrong, and he has lived to see every position for which he fought so valiantly vindicated by events. Closing a long article upon his career, particularly as the friend of the black people of the South, the "Kansas City Star," itself one of the foremost of the enlightened and independent journals of the West, made the following summary, which in a national campaign would be amplified by abundant specification:

"Mr. Watterson is now, and for a long time has been, the wisest counsellor in his party. He is right on every great question he discusses. He is not only right, but he is courageously, aggressively right. He is far-sighted. When others are groping their way, he has arrived at the correct conclusion. And his present conclusions ought to have additional weight in view of the vindication of those of the past."

O. O. STEALEY.

WOODROW WILSON.

ON March 4th, 1909, twelve years will have elapsed since Democrats lost control of the Federal Government. The two imperative questions as to which it now behooves them to make up their minds quickly are: first, do they believe that William

J. Bryan can obtain a majority of the electoral votes next November; and, if they feel themselves constrained to answer this inquiry in the negative, Do they deliberately prefer to lose the Presidency with Mr. Bryan or to win it with some other candidate? That Mr. Bryan cannot be successful, or, in other words, that he cannot get the 242 electoral votes necessary for a choice, is patent on the record of his two experiments. In 1896 he obtained only 176 electoral votes against McKinley's 271; in 1900 he got but 155 against McKinley's 292. If, now, we turn from aggregates to an examination of the figures in detail, we find that it was especially in the West, his "own country," that on his second experiment Mr. Bryan converted what four years before had given a promise of victory into the assurance of hopeless defeat. In view of these undisputed facts, what possible chance has Mr. Bryan of achieving more this year than he achieved in 1900, or even of recovering what he possessed in 1896?

Before putting forward the name of a substitute for Mr. Bryan, who is not yet by any means assured of a two-thirds vote in the Democratic National Convention to be held next July at Denver, let us inspect somewhat narrowly the conditions with which a Democratic nominee must comply if he is to gain the Presidency. He may count, of course, upon retaining the 120 electoral votes belonging to Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia. He ought also, if he is to have any prospect of triumph, to carry all the border States, with the exception of West Virginia (which, apparently, is unobtainable), namely, Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky and Missouri. All of the States, however, thus far named would not suffice. He would require also to carry New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, with either Indiana or Minnesota and North Dakota. Having thus got clearly in our mind the precise goal to be attained, it behooves us to look carefully for a man capable of attaining it. First, then, as regards the former slave States which lie on the border, and which (including West Virginia) gave Mr. Roosevelt four years ago 29 electoral votes, as against 20 given to Judge Parker. When one recalls that not since 1844 has the united Democracy nominated for the Presidency a man born and brought up in the South, can anybody familiar with the force of sectional pride believe that, if a Southern man were now put forward as the

Democratic standard-bearer, he would fail to sweep all of the former slave States from Delaware to Missouri, with the sole exception of West Virginia, or that even there he would not poll a phenomenal vote? Whatever else the presentation of a Southern nominee might accomplish, it would unquestionably stop, and probably once for all, Republican inroads upon Southern territory. Moreover, on patriotic, as well as partisan, grounds it has become expedient that the Democracy should nominate for the Presidency a man of Southern birth and breeding. Is it not obviously true that, although nominally the South was restored to the full privileges of States in the Union, when she was permitted to send Senators and Representatives to Congress she remains partially disfranchised so long as her sons are debarred from the highest honor in the gift of the Republic? We shall never witness a veritable reunion—not of force and law, but of heart—until, with the cordial concurrence of a large part of the North, a Southern man becomes Chief Magistrate. We profess in the North to have forgiven the South, but not yet can we claim to have brought forth fruits meet for forgiveness. In the South they professed—and they proved in 1898 that the profession was sincere—to have accepted accomplished facts and to have acquiesced loyally in a Union which they had failed to subvert. As we pointed out some two years ago in this REVIEW, their acquiescence deserves acknowledgment and their loyalty reward. That reward can only take one adequate, one convincing, one decisive form, namely, the elevation of a Southern man to the Presidency of the United States. As we also formerly pointed out, no observant and fair-minded Northerner will deny the existence of an abundance of Presidential timber in the South. It is not true that the States once Confederate have lost the breed of statesmen that used to dominate the Commonwealth. We could name many a Democratic Senator to-day, and more than one Democratic Representative or Governor, who, in respect of political experience, political insight and political prescience, measures fully up to the standard of Chief Magistrate. May it not, however, be true that these distinguished Southern legislators and State executives, by the very reason of their prolonged prominence in public life, and of their strenuous and gallant upholding of the interests of their section, are ill qualified to extirpate lingering prejudices at the North that ought to be extinct, and to

quench the last flickering embers of sectional animosity which it is a shame to keep alive? In the consideration of this question we would have our Democratic readers bear in mind that the question of nominating a Southern man to the Presidency is complicated with the imperative necessity that the first *post-bellum* Southern administration shall be memorably successful. If the first Southern administration since the Civil War should prove a failure, or only a half success, it is much to be feared that there would never be another, so vast and so rapidly increasing is the numerical preponderance of the North. To insure the necessary entire success it is indispensable that the temper of the Republicans, if beaten in 1908, shall be resigned and acquiescent, not angry, vindictive and defiant. In other words, if a Southern-born and a Southern-bred President is to leave behind him a bright record of constructive statesmanship and useful legislation, he must have the good-will, if not the active support, of the whole country, and such good-will is only to be gained from a conviction deep implanted at the North as well as at the South, that both sections can count upon his sympathy, and, above all, upon that intimate acquaintance without which sympathy is fruitless.

It is doubtless as true to-day as it was when we made the assertion in these pages two years ago, that such indispensable, all-embracing sympathy, such intimate and comprehensive acquaintance with the views, wishes and interests of all sections of the Republic, is not possessed at the present juncture by any professional Southern politician. No veteran Southern statesman would claim it, we think, though we are sure that more than one of them sincerely regrets the lack of it. Is it necessary, however, that the Democracy, in its search for a worthy and promising candidate for the Presidency, should confine itself to men who have spent the best part of their lives in the political arena? In this country political parties that have coveted success have not always circumscribed thus narrowly their field of selection. It was not, of course, his brief and almost speechless legislative experience in the Virginia Assembly that caused Washington in 1788 to receive every electoral vote for the Presidency. It was not his civil record in Tennessee that carried the victor of New Orleans to the White House in 1828. It was not the fact that he had been a member of both Houses of Congress and Governor

of Indiana Territory, but the fact that he had triumphed at Tippecanoe and had beaten British soldiers in the War of 1812 that caused the country to go "hell-bent" for William Henry Harrison in 1840. It was, of course, the battles of Palo Alto, of Resaca de la Palma and of Buena Vista that made Zachary Taylor Chief Magistrate, although he was asserted and believed never to have voted in his life. If the Republicans were overwhelmingly successful in 1868, it was because their choice had fallen on the man who hailed from Appomattox, although he had not voted for years, and although the latest vote cast by him before the Civil War is alleged to have been cast for a Democrat.

Nor, again, as we pointed out in 1906, have party managers in the United States always confined themselves to the army when, turning away for the moment from professional politicians, they have discussed or agreed on the selection of a candidate from some other field of public usefulness. We can see, for instance, in retrospect that if the Republican National Convention in 1856 had followed the advice of Thaddeus Stevens and nominated Justice McLean of the United States Supreme Court the latter would probably have carried Pennsylvania and, in all likelihood, have gained a majority of the electoral votes. Is it only in the legislative arena, in the army or in the judiciary that great political parties must seek a name to conjure with in contests for the Presidency? Is it true that, as things are now, the intellect of the nation flows solely or mainly through those channels? Has not industry its generals, its commanders-in-chief, its conquerors? It is possibly true, however, that in our day, owing to the inimical relations of labor and capital, a conqueror in the field of industrial evolution, highly qualified as he might be on the score of intellectual worth and of services to the country, would be unavailable as a candidate if considered from the viewpoint of his vote-getting ability.

There remains a field of activity and usefulness, the importance of which to the nation cannot be overestimated, nor would any thoughtful man dispute that the eminent and fruitful workers in that field may challenge the highest office in the gift of the American people on the score of merit and of availability. We refer, of course, to the victors in the vast and inestimable department of public instruction; to the great captains of the higher education. The designation of such men for distinguished func-

tions under the Federal Government is by no means unprecedented. George Bancroft had been a college tutor and school-master, and he left incomplete his famous "History of the United States" to become Secretary of the Navy in the Polk administration, and subsequently he was sent to represent his country in London and in Berlin. Edward Everett left the Presidency of Harvard College to become Secretary of State. Mr. Andrew D. White, the former President of Cornell University, has more than once been invited to occupy the highest posts in the nation's diplomatic service. No one has ever disputed that the statesman-like duties assumed by these organizers, directors and inspirers of the higher education were admirably discharged. Why, then, should not the Democratic party in 1908, when seeking a nominee for the Presidency, who will not only deserve, but command, success, turn its eyes in the same promising direction? Is it not quite possible to find among the Presidents of honored universities a man richly qualified for the headship of the Federal Government by great natural ability, by long and distinguished professional experience, by the illuminating and invigorating trend of his historical studies, by the sanity and prescience of his political and politico-economical opinions, by his exceptional popularity and by his unique power of securing the confidence, the sympathy and the support of all sections of the Union—South and North?

We submit that such a man may be found in Woodrow Wilson of Virginia and New Jersey, now President of Princeton University. Woodrow Wilson was born at Staunton, Virginia, in December, 1856, and is not, therefore, fifty-two years old. After graduating from Princeton in 1879, and studying law in the University of Virginia, he began the practice of his profession in Georgia, where he married a native of Savannah. Impelled by his personal tastes and aptitudes to transfer his energies from the law to the field of the higher education, he became successively a Professor of History and Political Economy in Bryn Mawr College and in Wesleyan University; then a Professor of Jurisprudence and Politics at Princeton; and, finally, since August, 1902, he has been the President of the last-named seat of learning and of science. We need not say that he is held in the highest honor by every Princeton graduate and by all university men in the United States. He is known to a multitude of thoughtful

readers as the author of "Congressional Government: A Study of American Politics"; of "The State: Elements of Historical and Practical Politics"; of "Division and Reunion, 1829-89"; of a life of "George Washington"; and, finally, of an elaborate and comprehensive "History of the American People." No one who reads understandingly the last-named work can fail to be impressed with the conviction that, by instinct and education, the author is a statesman. The grasp of fundamental principles, the seemingly intuitive application of primary truths to changing conditions, the breadth of thought and the cogency of reasoning exemplified in the "History of the American People" have rightly been acclaimed as clear evidences of sagacity worthy of Virginia's noblest traditions, as have also been the eloquent appeals addressed in 1905 by President Wilson to his brethren of the South, in which he called upon them to rise manfully from the ashes of prejudice and lethargy and come back into their own. It was only last month that in the pages of this REVIEW President Wilson directed attention to the ominous fact that we are now stripping the States of the powers reserved to them in the Tenth Amendment of the Constitution, and transferring those powers to the hands of Federal commissions. In the same article he warned us that this centralizing process was sapping the "vitality" of the Union, and that uniform Federal regulations of the economic conditions of a territory so vast and a people so various as are those of the United States would be highly mischievous if not impracticable.

We have pointed out the qualifications of Woodrow Wilson of Virginia and New Jersey on the score of intrinsic merit and of availability for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency in 1908. If, now, we are asked what States we believe that he could carry we answer, first, every State south of the Potomac and the Ohio, together with Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas and Oklahoma; secondly, New York, New Jersey and Connecticut; thirdly, if Governor John A. Johnson of Minnesota can be prevailed upon to accept the second place upon the Democratic ticket, we claim for it the States of Minnesota and North Dakota. A moment's computation will prove that the States which we have designated command a majority of the electoral votes.

MAYO W. HAZELTINE.